

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 30-61 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 30, 36, 38, and 44 are amended. No new matter is added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claim 36 has been amended to address the Examiner's comments. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 30, 32-34, 38-39, 41-44, 46-50, 52-54, and 57-58 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sahota et al. (hereinafter "Sahota"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0056460. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Amendment filed November 20, 2007, independent claims 30 and 38 were amended to recite, *inter alia*, wherein a same string of the web-document provided to the terminal has a different token according to whether it is a markup or a non-markup. In the present Amendment, independent claims 30 and 38 have been amended to further recite wherein each different token is generated by a corresponding parser. Sahota does not disclose or suggest such features, or the respective claimed combinations of independent claims 30 and 38.

That is, the Examiner refers to paragraph [0065] of Sahota as disclosing these features. However, paragraph [0065] of Sahota merely states that:

[0065] At operation 202, an HTML web page is parsed. For example, HTML parser engine 217 can parse an HTML web page from Internet content and web sites 213. In one embodiment, selected tags, styles, and content are either replaced or removed from the HTML page. Such a modification can be displayed in a browser to see the changes.

Nowhere does it disclose or suggest wherein a same string of the web-document provided to the terminal has a different token according to whether it is a markup or a non-markup. Referring, for example, to the exemplary embodiment disclosed in the present application, page 10, lines 5-14 teach that:

In the document supplied to the integral parser 214, that is, the web-document, a string has a different token according to whether it is a markup or a non-markup in contrast to a general programming language. For example, in the case of <html>, <p>html</p> and <!--html-->, the html is classified into a different token. <html> represents an element type. <p>html</p> represents parsed character data. <!--html--> represents a comment. Therefore, <html>, <p>html</p> and <!--html--> have different tokens from each other.

Consequently, as for the state of the token, different tokens can be extracted from even the same word according to the state of the word parser 310. The word parser 310 classifies the tokens into a comment, a start tag and parsed character data, and parses them.

Further, in the Advisory Action, the Examiner argued regarding the features of “wherein a same string of the web-document provided to the terminal has a different token according to whether it is a markup or a non-markup” that:

Sahota discloses that HTML parser engine 217 can parse an HTML web page from Internet content and web sites 213. In one embodiment, selected tags, styles, and content are either replaced or removed from the HTML page. So the HTML parser can parse any tags, styles, or content. Referring to [A]pplicant[s] specification, the parser looks at selected comments, tags and styles, and based on

that parses the content represented by the different styles. The parser looks at the different representation, such as tags to determine the type, such as element, comment, and character data.

However, the Examiner's reference to Sahota discussed above that "selected tags, styles, and content are either replaced or removed from the HTML page...[s]o the HTML parser can parse any tags, styles, or content" does not teach "wherein a same string of the web-document provided to the terminal has a different token according to whether it is a markup or a non-markup."

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 30 and 38 over Sahota should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 32-34, 39, and 41-43 are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 30 and 38, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features.

In the Amendment filed November 20, 2007, independent claim 44 was amended to recite, *inter alia*, wherein the word parser includes an attribute parser configured to recognize at least one of a name of an attribute or a value of the attribute. The Examiner merely repeats the text of the previous Office Action without addressing the claim amendments. It is respectfully submitted that Sahota does not disclose or suggest these features of independent claim 44, or the claimed combination.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 44 over Sahota should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 46-47 are allowable over Sahota at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 44, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

In the Amendment filed November 20, 2007, independent claims 48, 49, 57, and 58 were amended to recite, *inter alia*, wherein the integral parser includes a word parser that extracts and separates tokens of the web-document supplied to the terminal regardless of a kind of a markup language used to compose the web-document by referring to the token table, and wherein the word parser includes an attribute parser configured to recognize at least one of a name of an attribute or a value of the attribute. Sahota does not disclose or suggest such features, or the respective claimed combinations of independent claims 48, 49, 57, and 58.

Regarding these features, the Examiner asserts that:

Content Converter 204 is responsible for transforming, e.g., XML data files 208a or other type media, to new formats using templates, content, and media 209a. [0053]; The “@<attribute name>” function, e.g., @ SRC-starting from the first , retrieves the value for SRC,=http://image.weather.com/pics/blank.gif. The “All” function, starting from the first , retrieves one long string containing all elements, attributes and text, as shown below.[0133]

However, nowhere does Sahota disclose or suggest an integral parser that includes a word parser that extracts and separates tokens of the web-document supplied to the terminal regardless of a kind of a markup language used to compose the web-document by referring to the token table, and wherein the word parser includes an attribute parser configured to recognize

at least one of a name of an attribute or a value of the attribute, as recited in independent claims 48-49, 57, and 58.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 48-49, 57, and 58 over Sahota should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 50 and 52-54 are allowable over Sahota at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 48, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claims 31, 40, 45, 51, and 59 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahota in view of Mackie et al. (hereinafter “Mackie”), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0054535. It appears that the Examiner intended to include claim 60 in this rejection. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 31, 40, 45, 51, and 59-60 are allowable over Sahota at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 30, 38, 44, and 48, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features. Mackie fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sahota, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching a comment parser, a markup start parser, an attribute parser, and a parsed character data analyzer. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 31, 40, 45, 51, and 59-60 over Sahota and Mackie should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 35, 36, 37, and 55-56 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahota and Mackie in view of Chadha et al. (hereinafter “Chadha”), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0184552. The rejection is respectfully traversed

Independent claims 35 and 37 recite, *inter alia*, if the contents of the element are not the parsed character data, reading data until an end tag appears. Independent claim 55 recites, *inter alia*, if the contents of the elements are not the parsed character data, determining whether an end tag appears. None of the applied references discloses or suggests such features, or the respective claimed combinations of independent claims 35, 37, and 55.

The Examiner asserts that this feature is taught by paragraph [0035] of Chadra. However, this paragraph does not disclose or suggest the feature that if the contents of the element are not the parsed character data, reading data until an end tag appears.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 35, 37, and 55 over Sahota, Mackie, and Chadha should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 36 and 56 are allowable over Sahota, Mackie, and Chadra in view of their respective dependency on independent claims 35 and 55, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claim 61 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahota in view of Web Design Group comments. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claim 61 is allowable over Sahota at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 30, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. The Web Design Group comments fail to overcome the deficiencies of Sahota, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching the comments feature. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 61 over Sahota and the Web Design Group comments should be withdrawn.

Serial No. **10/539,762**

Docket No. **HI-0189**

Amdt. dated **August 18, 2008**

Reply to Office Action of April 17, 2008

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP


Carol L. Druzbeck
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 CLD:tlg

Date: August 18, 2008

\\Fk4\Documents\2019\2019-195\168232.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610